



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/031,410 | 06/21/2002 | Peter Eriksson | 59760 (47137) | 2145 |
| 21874 | 7590 | 06/08/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| EDWARDS ANGELI, PALMER & DODGE LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205 | | | KETTER, JAMES S | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| | | | 1636 | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| | | | 06/08/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/031,410 | Applicant(s) ERIKSSON ET AL. |
| | Examiner James S. Ketter | Art Unit 1636 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6,8-15,17-22,25,26,28,31-33 and 35-39 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-15,17-22,25,26,28,31-33 and 35-39 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 June 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Upon reconsideration of the claims, a number of problems under 35 USC§112, second paragraph, have been identified, engendering the rejection set forth below.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-22, 25, 26, 28, 31-33 and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claims 1 and 38, said claims, as well as claims 2-6, 8-15, 17-22, 25, 26, 28, 31-33, 35-37 and 39, which depend therefrom, recite “the electric field minimizes the risk for unwanted fusion of surrounding cells”. However, it is not clear what constitutes minimizing such a risk. Clearly, the lowest risk would result from a zero field strength, i.e., not practicing the method. Above a zero field strength, it is not clear what field strength would represent such minimization.

Claims 9 and 10 recite “electrode(s)”. However, claim 2, from which they depend, recites a single electrode. As such, the alternative plural is confusing, as it is not clear what other electrodes are intended.

Claim 22 recites “fusogenic or other agent that promotes close cell-cell contacts.” However, the scope of the claim is rendered unclear, because it is not clear if the phrase encompasses all agents that promote close cell-cell contacts, in which case the recitation of the

fusogenic agent is confusing as it adds nothing to the claim, or if only a subset of said agents that promote close cell-cell contacts was intended, in which case it is not clear what that subset is.

Claims 25, 26 and 28 are confusing, as they are drawn to a method of using a method, and do not actually contain any process steps beyond those implied by the method of the claim from which they depend.

Claim 33 recites “one electrode(s)”, which is confusing as to whether the plural is actually included.

In claim 35, the terms in vitro and ex vivo are used as mutually exclusive in the art, and as such, the equation of the terms in the instant claim is confusing.

Claim 39 is improper and confusing as it depends from itself in part.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Ketter whose telephone number is 571-272-0770. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JSK
8 June 2009

/James S. Ketter/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1636